

A Process for Technical Revisions During CLRTAP Emissions Inventory Review

A Report of the TFEIP
May 2017

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Report Title | A Process for Technical Revisions During CLRTAP Emissions Inventory Review |
| Customer | Submitted to the TFEIP 2017 for discussion |
| Recipient | |
| Report Reference | TFEIP/02E17/CD |
| Report Status | VERSION 3.0 – For comment |
| Revisions | V1.0 – TFEIP discussion paper (02/05/2017) V2.0 – Includes minor amendments to para 11, 12, 13 and 15. V3.0 - Minor text amendments and reference to CLRTAP documentation. |
| Author(s) | Chris Dore (TFEIP Co-Chair) |
| Date | 25/05/2017 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Aether Ltd Oxford Centre for Innovation New Road Oxford OX1 1BY | chris.dore@aether-uk.com +44 (0) 1865 261466 |
|---|---|

Contents

| | | |
|----------|---|----------|
| 1 | Context | 2 |
| 2 | Introduction..... | 2 |
| 3 | The Process of Determining and Calculating Technical Revisions | 3 |
| 4 | Quantification of a Technical Revision..... | 4 |

1 Context

1. At its 2016 meeting, the EMEP Steering Body agreed to adopt updated Emission Review Guidelines ⁽¹⁾ for a one year trial period. That document presents the individual steps in the process of undertaking technical reviews of national emission inventories under the CLRTAP (so called 'Step 1, 2 and 3' reviews). It also explains that one of the purposes of the inventory review is to "inform the work of the Implementation Committee by providing an objective, consistent, transparent and comprehensive technical assessment of the annual quantitative and qualitative inventory information submitted by Parties".
2. One of the key additions to the revised 'Emission Review Guidelines' document is the inclusion of 'Technical Corrections' These allow the Expert Review Teams (ERT) to work together with Parties during the review process to develop revised emission estimates where reported data is found to be inconsistent with the recommended methodologies of the EMEP/EEA Guidebook or where emission estimates are not provided for an NFR source category.
3. A first draft of this document has been discussed at the 2017 meeting of the Task Force on Emission Inventories and Projections in Krakow (11-12th May 2017). It describes a process for undertaking Technical Corrections as part of the CLRTAP emissions inventory review.
4. The finalised document will be provided to the CLRTAP Secretariat to be included as a formal meeting paper for the EMEP Steering Body Meeting in September 2017.
5. A process for 'Technical Revisions' within the 2017 review of emissions inventories under the European Union's (EU) new National Emission Ceilings Directive has recently been drafted. The proposed guidance included here for 'Technical Corrections' within the CLRTAP emissions inventory reviews aligns with this process to the extent possible, and also the processes used during greenhouse gas emissions inventory reviews. To ensure a common terminology is used across these different processes, this document refers to 'Revised Estimates' and 'Technical Corrections', collectively referred to as 'Technical Revisions'.

2 Introduction to Technical Revisions

6. The process of establishing Technical Revisions already exists as part of the annual review of greenhouse gas emissions inventories (under the EU greenhouse gas Monitoring Mechanism Regulation (MMR) and UNFCCC). However, it is a new concept in the field of air pollutant emissions inventory reviews.
7. Including Technical Revisions in the review process allows the ERT to work in a capacity building role with Parties to quantify necessary corrections to the national inventory where reported data are found to be inconsistent with the recommended methodologies of the EMEP/EEA Guidebook or where emission estimates are not provided for an NFR source category.
8. The objective of the Technical Revisions process is to establish improvements in completeness, consistency, comparability and accuracy of the reported emissions data from Parties.

¹ Emission Review Guidelines for the Technical Review of Air Pollutant Emission Inventories reported under the Convention and its Protocols. September 2016.

9. Where reported data are found to be inconsistent with the CLRTAP reporting requirements, and in particular the recommended methodologies of the most recent version of the EMEP/EEA Guidebook, or where emission estimates are not provided for an NFR source category, the ERT liaise with the Party to understand the issue in detail. Where necessary the ERT work with the Party to quantify the extent to which emissions might be corrected to ensure best practice and compliance with CLRTAP reporting requirements.
10. If the ERT considers that emissions are significantly under or overestimated², then during the review, the Party is invited to submit 'Revised Estimates' that address the issue raised. Should the Party decline to do this, or quantification of the Revised Estimates cannot be agreed, then the ERT may calculate a 'Technical Correction' in the absence of an updated emission estimate being provided by the Party itself.
11. Revised Estimates and Technical Corrections (whether agreed with the Party or not) will be included in the country specific review reports which are provided to the EMEP Steering Body. The final reports will be published on the CEIP website.
12. As is outlined in the agreed "Emission Review Guidelines" (¹), CEIP will inform Parties' contact points and the CLRTAP secretariat on the status of annual review. The secretariat will communicate with Parties' representatives in the EMEP Steering Body, and with the Implementation Committee.

3 The Process of Determining and Calculating Technical Revisions

13. The following provides a summary of the process by which Technical Revisions are determined. Dates and deadlines for each stage will be issued before the beginning of each review, and resource constraints may limit the work that is possible. A Technical Revision may be relevant for more than one emission source category, the whole time-series or for a selected year, and may also be applicable for more than one pollutant:

During the Desk Review or Centralised Review Week

- a) During an emissions inventory review ("desk" or "centralised" sections of the review), the ERT highlights an observation and issues questions to the Party. The ERT mentions in their questioning whether this could relate to a 'significant'¹ over or under estimate, and hence a possible Technical Revision.
- b) The Party responds with clarifications and/or answers. The Party can provide a justification for their existing estimate, or propose a Revised Estimate that addresses the issue raised by the ERT. The Revised Estimate may span several sources, several pollutants, and be relevant for multiple years.
- c) If the ERT agrees with the Party's response (i.e. a valid justification or Revised Estimate calculated and provided by the Party) the issue is considered closed and a recommendation is made in the Party's review report i.e. that the updated estimate should be included in the Party's next annual inventory submission. However, should the ERT not be able to reach

² The term "significant" is defined by the use of a threshold of significance. See Section 4.

agreement with the Party, then the ERT will calculate a Technical Correction which is sent to the Party for comment.

Following the Centralised Review Week

- d) After the centralised review week, a Party can respond to indicate that they agree with the proposed Technical Correction. The issue is then dealt with as for a Revised Estimate. Alternatively, a Party can respond that they disagree with the Technical Correction proposed by the ERT, and provide a justification for their position.
- e) If the ERT do not agree with the information provided by the Party (or no response is provided), they inform the Party, and include the Technical Correction in the draft review report that is sent to the Party.

Following the Compilation of the Draft Review Report

- f) The Party will have the opportunity to respond to the ERT's conclusions in the draft review report.
- g) The ERT will make a final decision on whether to include the Technical Correction in the final review report.
- h) The final review report will be provided to the EMEP Steering Body and made available to the Implementation Committee, as explained in paragraphs 11 and 12 above.

4 Quantification of a Technical Revision

14. **Threshold of Significance:** The threshold of significance will be established by the Expert Review Teams and CEIP review secretariat prior to each emissions inventory review. Different metrics may be used (e.g. a percentage of the national total, an absolute value etc.).
 - a. **Exceedance:** Should the impact of an issue raised during the review (aggregated across all relevant sources) exceed a "threshold of significance", then a Technical Revision will be required.
 - b. **Non-exceedance:** Should the aggregated impact of an issue raised during the review not exceed the threshold of significance, then the ERT will make a recommendation for improvement to be addressed in the next version of the emissions inventory, unless the Lead Reviewer considers there to be exceptional circumstances.
15. **Methodologies:** Technical Revisions will be calculated in consultation with the respective Party by using the default methodologies and emission factors (Tier 1 or Tier 2) provided in the most recent version of the EMEP/EEA Guidebook. Activity data will be taken from the Party's submission, the IIR, and/or other appropriate sources including national and international statistical organizations. A Tier 2 approach will be used for the calculation of Technical Corrections for key categories where this is possible. The ERT will document and justify cases where a Technical Correction cannot be performed, while making every effort to keep those cases to a minimum.
16. **Adjustment Applications:** Where a Technical Revision is required for a source, or sources, which are also involved in an Adjustment Application, the Technical Revision will be resolved first. The Adjustment Application may then require amendment. The Adjustment Application will be reviewed if resources permit.